

REMARKS

Claims 21-47 are currently pending in this application. The above amendments and the following remarks are considered by Applicants to overcome the objections and rejections raised by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants request the reconsideration and allowance of claims 21-47.

The specification was objected to by the Examiner for containing grammatical and idiomatic errors. However, the Examiner did not reference any specific paragraph in the specification that was objectionable. Applicants request the Examiner to point out the objectionable portions of the specification.

Claims 21-24, 33, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meier (U.S. Patent No. 6,970,459). The Examiner takes the position that Meier teaches or suggests all the features recited in claims 21-24, 33, 46, and 47. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Meier discloses a communication system having multiple protocols. Specifically, Meier discloses that registrations protocols are combined in a single packet when a wireless device roams to different VLANs. Outbound messages are handled by an access point such that the wireless device is not burdened with the associated computational overhead. Meier also discloses a wireless device may dynamically switch between a VLAN-aware state and a VLAN unaware state depending on the nature of a detected access point.

It is submitted that Meier does not teach or suggest all the features recited in claims 21, 46, and 47. Specifically, it is submitted that Meier does not teach or suggest the feature of linking the client system to the target network based on the requirements, wherein the requirements of the host system are not essential for connecting the client system to the target network.

Claim 21 is amended to recite that the requirements of the host system are not essential for connecting the client system to the target network. In contrast to the claimed invention, the Meier reference does not teach or suggest that the host system preferences are not essential. Rather, the Meier reference states that the client is responsible for detecting and registering with its MVTP server whenever it first roams to an IP subnet. In other words, Meier discloses that the requirements of the host system are met prior to connecting the client system to the target network. In contrast, the claimed invention provides a system wherein the requirements of the host system are not essential for connecting the client system to the target network. Therefore, in view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 21, 46, and 47 recite subject matter

that is neither taught nor suggested by Meier. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21, 46, and 47 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 22-24 and 33 are dependent upon claim 21. It is submitted that claims 22-24 and 33 recite patentable subject matter for at least the reasons mentioned above. Therefore, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22-24, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

Claims 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meier in view of Lynch (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,600). The Examiner takes the position that the combination of Meier and Lynch teach or suggest all the features recited in claims 25-28. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 25-28 are dependent upon claim 21. Therefore, it is submitted that Lynch fails to cure the deficiencies of Meier. Specifically, the combination of the cited references fail to teach or suggest linking the client system to the target network based on the requirements, wherein the requirements of the host system are not essential for connecting the client system to the target network. Thus, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 25-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 29-32, and 34-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meier, Lynch and Tummala (U.S. Patent No. 6,915,345). The Examiner takes the position that the combination of the cited references teach or suggest all the features recited in claims 29-32, and 34-45. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claims 29-32, and 34-45 are dependent upon claim 21. Therefore, it is submitted that neither Lynch nor Tummala cure the deficiencies of Meier. Specifically, the combination of the cited references fail to teach or suggest linking the client system to the target network based on the requirements, wherein the requirements of the host system are not essential for connecting the client system to the target network. Thus, Applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 29-32, and 34-45 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 21-47, the only claims pending in this application, are believed by applicants to define patentable subject matter and should be passed to issue at the earliest possible time. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and favorable reconsideration and prompt notice to that affect are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

July 3, 2007

By: 
Bala K. Sundararajan, Reg. No.50,900
Reed Smith LLP
599 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10022-765
(212) 521-5400